

features of the present invention as recited in the claims is "means for programming and processing events triggering a search for the fixed part or parts of the local networks . . . said programming and processing means activating the search means on the occurrence of programmed triggering events."

To show this feature is anticipated by the cited art, the Examiner cites column 1, lines 52-61 as teaching that if the telephone is outside a geographic area, which is usually covered by the cordless network, the cordless section of the telephone is automatically disconnected. As the user is given an indication of such disconnection in order to decide whether the disabling is incorrect, he or she can manually override it. Therefore, the Examiner alleges that by giving the user the ability to manually update the group of cellular cells that provide cordless coverage, discloses the programming and processing means recited in claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner mischaracterizes the art (most likely in hindsight in view of the present invention). Specifically, the cited section provides:

The telephone is hereby capable of determining its own position on the basis of information from the cellular network and comparing this position with a geographical area usually covered by a cordless network. If the telephone is outside this area, the cordless part of the telephone is automatically disabled.

This disabling may be indicated to the user so that if he considers the disabling to be wrong, it can be manually overruled. The group of cellular cells providing cordless coverage can hereby be updated.

Thus, this section states that if the telephone is located outside of an area known to have cordless network coverage, the cordless part of the telephone is disabled. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that this feature is to help extend the battery life (see also col. 1, lines 29-33 which teaches that the method of Dalsgaard et al. was invented to overcome the problem of continuous monitoring by dual-mode telephones to save battery life). As such, a mention of the Dalsgaard et al. device having the ability for a user to “punch” a key in order to not disconnect (a disabling feature) is not at all suggestive of “programming and processing events triggering a search.” In fact, no “search” at all is initiated at this time in the Dalsgaard et al. device, and likewise, there are no programming events suggested. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1, as well as claims 2-10 that are dependent on claim 1, are allowable.

Claim 3 recites that the triggering event is a predefined sequence of keystrokes associated with a command of the terminal. The Examiner states that Dalsgaard et al. disclose a terminal, wherein the triggering event is a predefined sequence of keystrokes associated with a command of the terminal, other than the command which switches the communication means to operate with a preferred local network (citing col. 1, lines 58-61 alleging that the user is able to update or override predefined inputs). Again, as discussed above, when the user of the Dalsgaard et al. device “punches” the keys in the section cited by the Examiner, it is to prevent disabling the Dalsgaard et al. device, and not a triggering event as defined in the present application. As such, claim 3 is allowable for this feature, as well as claims 8-10 which also recite the triggering event feature.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dalsgaard et al. in view of Van Der Salm (U.S. Patent No. 6,343,220). The Examiner states that regarding claim 4, Dalsgaard et al. do not explicitly teach means for evaluating the traffic load of a local network as a function of time, and wherein the triggering event is the traffic load of the local network falling below a predefined threshold; yet the Examiner finds this teaching in Van Der Salm. The Examiner states that Van Der Salm teaches a multi-mode terminal that can be set to operate over a specific network during busy hours while the other network is less loaded. Therefore, the Examiner alleges that the network is selected dependent on the time or the traffic load of a particular network (citing col. 6, lines 22-30).

Since Dalsgaard et al. is silent with respect to a triggering event, Applicants submit that its combination with Van Der Salm would not be obvious. Again, Dalsgaard et al. solves the problem of saving battery life. As such, it does not suggest evaluating traffic loads of networks as acknowledged by the Examiner. Van Der Salm merely teaches that a network operator can switch calls over a particular network during busy hours. There is no suggestion of programmed triggering events as in the present invention. As such, the combination of these two references does not disclose or suggest the claimed features. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 4 is allowable for this reason as well as its dependence on claim 1.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 09/754,212

Attorney Docket No. Q62416

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald Kimble
Registration No. 44,186

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 21, 2004